

REMARKS

After the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-27 are currently pending in the application as amended. Claims 4, 8, 10, 12 and 15-19 have been amended to correct various antecedent errors. Specifically, claims Claim 4 and 15-17 have been amended to depend from claim 3. Claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 6. Claim 10 has been amended to delete the redundancy caused by the dependency amendment to claim 8. Claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 4. Claim 18 has been amended to insert the word “driving” omitted from the first and second driving levers. Claim 19 has been amended to depend from claim 4. The abstract has been amended to fit within the length requirement. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Objection to the Abstract

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract because its length exceeds 150 words. The Abstract has been amended to fit within the length requirement. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the abstract be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-6, 9-10, 14-17, 19, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner has rejected claims 4-6, 9-10, 14-17, 19, 21 and 22 for lack of clear antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully traverse each of these rejections in view of the foregoing amendment.

i) Claims 4-6 and 21-22

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 for reciting the phrase “a second force applying structure” which implies that there is antecedence for a “first force”. Claim 4 has been amended to depend from claim 3 which includes “a first force applying structure”. Claims 5-6 and 21-22 continue to depend directly or indirectly from claim 4. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 4-6 and 21-22 be withdrawn.

ii) Claims 9 and 10

The Examiner has rejected claim 9 for reciting the phrase “the second cam structure” without having proper antecedent basis. Claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 6 which depends from claim 5. Claim 5 recites “a second cam structure”. Claim 10 continues to depend directly from claim 9. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 9 and 10 be withdrawn.

iii) Claim 14

The Examiner has rejected claim 14 for reciting the phrase “the base portion” without having proper antecedent basis. Claim 14 depends from claim 12. Claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 4. Claim 4 recites “a base portion”. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

iv) - vi) Claims 15-17

The Examiner has rejected claims 15-17 for reciting the phrase “the fitting portion” without having proper antecedent basis. Claims 15-17 have each been amended to depend from claim 3. Claim 3 recites “a fitting portion”. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 15-17 be withdrawn.

vii) - viii) Claim 19

The Examiner has rejected claim 19 for reciting the phrase “the second force applying structure” and the phrase “the first force applying structure” without having proper antecedent basis. Claim 19 has been amended to depend from claim 4. Claim 4 recites “a second force applying structure”. Claim 4 depends from claim 3. Claim 3 recites “a first force applying structure”. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claim 19 be withdrawn.

In summary and in view of the above amendment, it is requested that all of the stated antecedent basis errors have been corrected and that the §112 rejections of claims 4-6, 9-10, 14-17, 19, 21 and 22 be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Application No. 10/533,048
Reply to Office Action of July 17, 2007

The Examiner indicated that claims 1-3, 7-8, 11-13, 18, 20 and 23-27 are allowable and that claims 4-6, 9-10, 14-17, 19 and 21-22 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the §112 rejections.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims claim 1-27 include allowable subject matter. As was described above, claims 4-6, 9-10, 14-17, 19 and 21-22 have been amended to correct all of the antecedent errors. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully note that the present Amendment places the application, including claims 1-27 as amended into allowable form.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing Amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 1-27, as amended, is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Masahiro Inata

October 12, 2007
(Date)

By:


MARTIN G. BELISARIO

Registration No. 32,886

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

One Commerce Square
2005 Market Street, Suite 2200
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013
Telephone: 215-965-1200
Direct Dial: 215-965-1303
Facsimile: 215-965-1210
E-Mail: mbelisario@akingump.com

MGB/JLH